



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,064	11/02/2005	Andreas Schmidt	112740-1055	7573
29177 7590 03/19/2008 BELI, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P.O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690				
EXAMINER TORRES, MARCOS L				
ART UNIT 2617		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 03/19/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/523,064

**Applicant(s)**

SCHMIDT ET AL.

**Examiner**

MARCOS L. TORRES

**Art Unit**

2617

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 23-28, 30-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich US006101393A in view of Bedingfield 20020110227.

As to claim 23, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system (see col. 1, lines 7-10), the method comprising: receiving a message from a sender at a service provider (see col. 3, lines 37-45); and transmitting the message from the service provider to a recipient serviced by the service provider (see col. 3, lines 50-66), wherein the message is transmitted from the service provider to the recipient only if the sender does not appear on a list of exclusions (see col. 5, lines 22-50); wherein the service provider transmits the message to the recipient and receives notification if the recipient wants to have the sender of the message put on a list of exclusions (see col. 5, lines 51-66). Alperovich discloses that other alternatives names can be used (see col. 6, lines 15-20), however it is unclear if with the use of those alternative names the user can still identify the sender. In an analogous art Bedingfield discloses wherein the service provider transmits the message anonymously to the recipient and receives notification if the recipient wants to have the sender of the message put on a list of exclusions the notification to the service provider containing a message identifier as an identification signal from which only the service provider can determine an identity of the sender, with the message identifier being a reference to a storage location of a message identification element [envelope information] (see par 0062-0067). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine these teachings to properly route and treat all messages according to their respective setting, thereby blocking undesirable message while keeping the anonymity of the sender (par. 0007).

As to claim 24, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the list of exclusions is managed by the service provider (see col. 5, lines 22-25).

As to claim 25, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the list of exclusions is a personal, individual list of exclusions of the recipient (see col. 6, lines 7-9).

As to claim 26, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the list of exclusions is a general list of exclusions that is taken into consideration for at least one of all recipients and groups of recipients (see col. 6, lines 7-10).

As to claim 27, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the notification to the service provider is formed as a self-contained abstract message (message that contain the "identification signal" (name of sender); see col. 5, lines 51-66).

As to claim 28, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the notification to the service provider is integrated in the abstract message in the information element form (message that contain the "identification signal" (name of sender); see col. 5, lines 51-66).

As to claim 30, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the notification to the service provider contains further information for the filter functionality, including at least a type of the list of exclusions and time limitations (see col. 5, lines 22-50; col. 6, lines 7-9).

Regarding claims 31-36, 38 and 40, they are the corresponding system claims of method claims 23-28, 30 and 39. Therefore, claims 31-36, 38 and 40 are rejected for the same reasons shown above.

As to claim 39, Alperovich discloses a method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system (see col. 1, lines 7-10), the method comprising: receiving a message from a sender at a service provider (see col. 3, lines 37-45); transmitting the message from the service provider to a recipient serviced by the service provider using an alias [alternative] name for the sender (see col. 3, lines 50-66; col. 6, lines 15-20), wherein the message is transmitted from the service provider to the recipient only if the sender was not previously placed on a list of exclusions (see col. 5, lines 22-50), and receiving notification at the service provider if the recipient wants to have the sender of the message put on the list of exclusions, wherein the notification to the service provider contains the alias [alternative] name as an identification signal. It is unclear in the Alperovich reference if using the alternative name still identifies the sender (see col. 5, line 51 -col. 6, line 20). In an analogous art, Bedingfield disclose wherein sender identification related to the alias name is only known to the service provider and receiving notification at the service provider if the recipient wants to have

the sender of the message put on the list of exclusions, wherein the notification to the service provider contains the alias [alternative] name as an identification signal

6. Claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich in view of Bedingfield and further in view of Rooke US 20020044634A1.

As to claim 29, Alperovich discloses the method for blocking undesirable messages in a mobile radio system wherein the notification to the service provider is contained in user data of Message (see col. 5, lines 51-66). Alperovich does not specifically disclose that the message is a Multimedia Message. In an analogous art, Rooke discloses sending a Multimedia Message to send a notification to the service provider (see par. 0041-0043). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a Multimedia Message to send the notification to the service provider in order to be compatible with the MMS standard.

Regarding claim 37 is the corresponding system claim of method claim 29. Therefore, claim 37 is rejected for the same reason shown above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Commissioner of Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

571-273-8300

for formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS L. TORRES whose telephone number is (571)272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2617



Art Unit: 2617

mlt